



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/635,480	08/07/2003	Alejandro Wiechers	200207443-1	1078
22879 7590 08/19/2008 HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400				
EXAMINER				
MILLA, MARK R				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2625				
NOTIFICATION DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/19/2008		ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

JERRY.SHORMA@HP.COM

mkraft@hp.com

ipa.mail@hp.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/635,480

Applicant(s)

WIECHERS, ALEJANDRO

Examiner

Mark R. Milia

Art Unit

2625

Period for Reply -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 May 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 24-34 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 and 24-34 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Applicant's amendment was received on 5/27/08 and has been entered and made of record. Currently, claims 1-11 and 24-34 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/27/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant asserts that Roztocil (US 2001/0044868) does not teach "receiving at the designer location from the print service provider location real time configuration information regarding a print production device at the print service provider location" and "creating at the designer location relative to the received configuration information a high performance file by encapsulating a plurality of files associated with a print job created at the designer location". The examiner respectfully disagrees as Roztocil does disclose such features. Particularly, Roztocil states that a digital print shop contains computer workstations **114** and **116**, servers **118** and **120**, and output devices **122** connected via network **112**. Network **112** may include a plurality of networks types, such as wired, wireless, LAN, Ethernet, or WAN (Internet) (see paragraph 21). Print jobs are received and manipulated using computers **114** and **116** and as such makes up the designer location. Roztocil also states that computers **114**

and **116** maybe combined into one workstation (see paragraph 29 lines 11-14). Print server **120** and output devices **122** make up the print service provider location. Therefore, communication between the computers **114** and **116** and server **120** and output devices **122** is established based on the output device (printer) selected by the user. Roztocil further states that output device availability and capabilities provided to a user and are utilized in print job fulfillment (see paragraphs 32 lines 22-26 and 45). Roztocil also states that "print ready" files are created at the designer location (computers **114** and **116**) during job preparation which takes output device attributes into consideration (see paragraphs 25, 27-29). Thus, Roztocil discloses "receiving at the designer location from the print service provider location real time configuration information regarding a print production device at the print service provider location" and "creating at the designer location relative to the received configuration information a high performance file by encapsulating a plurality of files associated with a print job created at the designer location".

Therefore, the rejection of claims 1-11 and 24-34 set forth in the previous Office Action is maintained and repeated in this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

4. Claims 1-6, 8, 24-29, and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2001/0044868 to Roztocil et al.

Regarding claim 1, Roztocil discloses a method of managing workflow in a commercial printing environment including a designer location and a print service provider location, said method comprising: creating at the designer location a digital file that represents an image to be printed (see Fig. 1 and paragraph 22), receiving at the designer location from the print service provider location real time configuration information regarding a print production device at the print service provider location (see paragraphs 23, 32 lines 22-26, 45 lines 1-6, 46 lines 1-16, and 52), creating at the designer location relative to the received configuration information a high performance file by encapsulating a plurality of files associated with a print job created at the designer location, the plurality of files includes the digital file that represents the image to be printed and a file that includes print job processing instructions (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 23, 25, and 27-28), submitting the high performance file from the designer location to the print service provider location via an electronic network (see paragraphs 22 lines 8-13, 25 lines 9-11, 29, and 32 lines 22-26), and performing at the print service provider location at least one of automated printing, finishing, packaging, and shipping relative to the instructions contained in the high performance file (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 29-30, 33 lines 2-4, 45 lines 1-6, 46-48, and 56).

Regarding claim 24, Roztocil discloses a system for managing workflow in a commercial printing environment, said system comprising: a designer location configured to: create a digital file that represents an image to be printed (see Fig. 1 and

paragraph 22), receive from a print service provider location real time configuration information regarding a print production device at the print service provider location (see paragraphs 23, 32 lines 22-26, 45 lines 1-6, 46 lines 1-16, and 52), create relative to the received configuration information a high performance file that encapsulates a plurality of files associated with a print job created at the designer location, the plurality of files including the digital file that represents the image to be printed and a file that includes print job processing instructions (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 23, 25, and 27-28), and submit the high performance file to the print service provider location via an electronic network (see paragraphs 22 lines 8-13, 25 lines 9-11, 29, and 32 lines 22-26), and a print service provider location configured to perform at least one of automated printing, finishing, packaging, and shipping relative to the instructions contained in the high performance file (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 29-30, 33 lines 2-4, 45 lines 1-6, 46-48, and 56).

Regarding claims 2 and 25, Roztocil further discloses verifying at the print service provider location that the digital file will be produced as indicated by the high performance file and, if not, correcting the high performance file to ensure production substantially as designed (see paragraphs 29-30, 45-48, and 56).

Regarding claims 3 and 26, Roztocil further discloses wherein the digital file includes the substance of the print job and the corresponding images and fonts (see paragraphs 25 lines 29-36, 29-30, 45-48 and 56).

Regarding claims 4 and 27, Roztocil further discloses wherein the plurality of files includes a job ticket that contains instructions regarding each stage of processing for the print job (see paragraphs 30, 45-48, and 56).

Regarding claims 5 and 16, Roztocil further discloses wherein the plurality of files includes a remote proof file that reflects the format that the final output of the print job should comprise (see paragraphs 29-30, 33, 45-48, and 56).

Regarding claims 6 and 29, Roztocil further discloses wherein the plurality of files includes an imposition information file that contains instructions regarding arrangement and spacing of the image to be printed on print media to be used in completing the print job (see paragraph 30).

Regarding claims 8 and 31, Roztocil further discloses performing at the designer location automated remote finishing setup to remotely select the desired finishing options and to prepare finishing instructions to effect the same, and wherein the plurality of files includes the finishing instructions (see paragraphs 45-48 and 56).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
6. Claims 7, 9, 30, and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roztocil.

Roztocil discloses the ability to print a document to a local printer (print a proof) and/or send the document to a service provider (see paragraphs 45-48 and 56).

Regarding claims 7 and 18, Roztocil does not disclose expressly wherein the plurality of files includes an imposition proof in electronic form that illustrates the arrangement and spacing.

However, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include an imposition proof file because it is well known in the art to proof a document to ensure that the final print is accurate to what is desired by the user/designer/customer. Proofing is commonly used in the art, as seen in several references listed in the IDS dated 8/7/03.

Regarding claims 9 and 20, Roztocil does not disclose expressly wherein the plurality of files includes an electronic image of a finishing mock-up of the image to be printed.

However, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to include an electronic image of a finishing mock-up because it is well known in the art to proof a document to ensure that the final print is accurate to what is desired by the user/designer/customer. Proofing is commonly used in the art, as seen in several references listed in the IDS dated 8/7/03.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine including proof and mock-up files in the plurality of files associated with the print job with Roztocil to obtain the invention as specified in claims 7, 9, 30, and 32.

7. Claims 10, 11, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Roztocil as applied to claims 1 and 24 above, and further in view of Kemp (US 2002/0078160).

Regarding claims 10 and 33, Roztocil discloses correcting the high performance file comprises adding missing instructions or revising instructions contained within the high performance file to account for changes in equipment (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 29-30, 33 lines 2-4, 45 lines 1-6, 46-48, and 56).

Roztocil does not disclose expressly performing at the designer location automated remote packaging setup to remotely select the desired packaging options and to prepare packaging instructions to effect the same, and wherein the plurality of files includes the packaging instructions.

Kemp discloses performing at the designer location automated remote packaging setup to remotely select the desired packaging options and to prepare packaging instructions to effect the same, and wherein the plurality of files includes the packaging instructions (see paragraphs 41, 64, 67, 69, and 85).

Regarding claims 11 and 34, Roztocil discloses correcting the high performance file comprises adding missing instructions or revising instructions contained within the high performance file to account for changes in equipment (see Fig. 1 and paragraphs 29-30, 33 lines 2-4, 45 lines 1-6, 46-48, and 56).

Roztocil does not disclose expressly performing at the designer location automated remote shipping setup to remotely select the desired shipping options and to

prepare shipping instructions to effect the same, and wherein the plurality of files includes the shipping instructions.

Kemp discloses performing at the designer location automated remote shipping setup to remotely select the desired shipping options and to prepare shipping instructions to affect the same, and wherein the plurality of files includes the shipping instructions (see paragraphs 41, 64, 67, 69, and 85).

Roztocil & Kemp are combinable because they are from the same field of endeavor, printing based on printer capabilities.

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to combine the selection of packaging and shipping instructions as described by Kemp, with the system of Roztocil.

The suggestion/motivation for doing so would have been to ensure a user receives a desired order when and where it is convenient for the user.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kemp with Roztocil to obtain the invention as specified in claims 10, 11, 33, and 34.

Conclusion

8. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark R. Milia whose telephone number is (571)272-7408. The examiner can normally be reached M-F 8:00am-4:00pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached at (571) 272-7437. The fax number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Mark R. Milia

Art Unit: 2625

Examiner
Art Unit 2625

/Mark R. Milia/
Examiner, Art Unit 2625

/David K Moore/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2625